



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,751	10/06/2000	Dan Matheson	4079.05SU1	2132
22879	7590	11/03/2004	EXAMINER	
HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			BAHTA, KIDEST	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2125	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/680,751	MATHESON, DAN	
	Examiner Kidest Bahta	Art Unit 2125	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 7-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 7-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/31/2003</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-6, 10-14, 18 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sebastian et al. (U. S. Patent 5,822,206).

Regarding claims 1-6, 10-14, 18 and 20, Sebastian discloses an object model for capturing information related to product innovation-related data, comprising: a product idea interface for capturing an idea for a product in a product idea object (Fig. 6), a design alternative interface for capturing a plurality of design alternatives for the product in a plurality of respective design alternative object (column 5, lines 22-28); a product requirement interface for capturing a requirement for the product idea in a product requirement object (column 6, lines 45-49; step 42); a product function fulfillment interface which captures how well the product function fulfills the product requirement (column 8, lines 54-65); a design representation interface for capturing a representation of the design alternative in a design representation object (column 15, lines 4-14); a decision interface for capturing a decision in a product requirement object, the decision relating to one of the product idea or the design alternative (column 5, lines 34-49); storing each of the product idea object, the design alternative object, the product requirement object, and the design representation object in a separate relational database, wherein associations between each of the product idea object, the design

alternative object, the product requirement object, and the design representation object are captures using foreign Keys (column 13, lines 57-67 and table 1); a requirement fulfillment interface for facilitating queries related to levels of fulfillment of requirement encapsulated in the product requirement objects by alternative designs encapsulated in the design alternative objects (column 16, lines 5-15; Fig. 3, steps 42-50 and 58); the product requirement objects encapsulate priority information and said requirement fulfillment interface processes the priority information to facilitate the queries (column 16, lines 29-38); a product requirement decision interface for storing and retrieving information associated with decisions related to requirement encapsulated within the product requirement objects (column 10, lines 24-37; column 17, lines 22-29; column 22, lines 54-64).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 7-9, 15-17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sebastian et al. (U. S. Patent 5,822,206) in view of Malaugh et al. (U.S. Patent 6,445,974).

Regarding claims 7-9, 15-17 and 19, Sebastian discloses the limitations of claims 1, 2, 5, 11, 13 and 18 as stated above in par. 2. However, Sebastian fails to disclose the limitations of claims 7-9, 15-17, and 19.

Malaugh discloses each to the product idea object, design alternative object, the product requirement object and design representation object are stored in a tool-neutral persistent form (column 2, lines 58-67, column 4, lines 12-22 and column 3, lines 44-49).

It would have been obvious to a person of the ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to combine the teachings of Sebastian with the teachings of Malaugh because it would provide with an improved system wherein even when a plurality of different electric CAD system are used, part selection data standardizes using a common platform is obtained and even when the individual department require information in different formats due to their different roles, information suitable for each department can be efficiently acquired.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed June 6, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding independent claims 1, 10, 18 and 21, Applicant argues Sebastian fails to disclose that “**design alternative object**”. However, Examiner disagrees sine Sebastian discloses that alternative in the design process (column 8, lines 14-30, column 10, lines 10-23; column 16, lines 46-57). In addition, Applicant argues Sebastian fails to disclose “a requirements fulfillment interface”. However, Examiner disagrees sine Sebastian discloses a requirements fulfillment interface (column 16, lines 5-15 ; Fig. 1 and Fig. 3, step 50 and 58; i.e., If these trials meet with approval (step 58), then a detailed tool design is made (step 60)).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning communication or earlier communication from examiner should be directed to Kidest Bahta, whose telephone number is (571) 271-3737. Examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. EST. If attempts to reach examiner by phone fail, examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard, can be reached (571) 271-3749. Additionally, fax phones for Art Unit 2125 is (703) 746-7239. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to status of this application should be directed to group receptionist at (703) 305-9600.

Kidest Bahta



October 29, 2004